

REMARKS

Subsequent to entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 4, 11, 18, 19 and 21-28¹ are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17 and 20 are hereby cancelled, and new claims 25-28 are introduced via this Amendment.

I. Formal Matters.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant notes that the Examiner has acknowledged the claim to foreign priority based on Korean Patent Application No. 00-71716 filed November 29, 2000, but indicates that the proper documentation has not been received. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to a copy of the date-stamped filing receipt enclosed herewith, which confirms receipt of a certified copy of the Korean Application filed on November 29, 2000, by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 15, 2001.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references submitted via Information Disclosure Statements filed on July 8, 2003; July 29, 2003; and August 7, 2003, as signified by returning initialled copies of Forms PTO/SB/08 to the office of the undersigned.

II. Claims.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Stone, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,750) ("*Stone*").

Claims 1-3, 7-8 and 12-17 are cancelled, and the above rejection of said claims is moot.

Claim 18 requires, "...a portable terminal for storing information related to a ticket issued..." *Stone* fails to disclose this portable element. Specifically, in Figs. 1a-2e and at col.

¹ Claims 1-24 were originally filed with the application papers on March 15, 2001, as evidenced by the Official Filing Receipt mailed to the office of the undersigned on August 31, 2001. However, the Office Action Summary (Form PTOL-326) indicates that only claims 1-23 are pending, although no claims were cancelled prior to this Amendment.

29, lines 41-45, *Stone* discloses optional onsite verification, as opposed to portable verification. Neither in the figures cited by the Examiner (OA page 7), nor in the text at large, does *Stone* disclose a portable terminal. At least for failing to disclose the element of a portable terminal, the rejection of claim 18 as anticipated by *Stone* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 is asserted as being allowable by virtue of its dependency from an allowable claim.

In addition, claim 19 is asserted as patentable over *Stone* on the following independent grounds. *Stone* discloses connections between components through a combination of an Internet, public phone lines, cellular, microwave, etc. (OA page 7; col. 13, line 62 through col. 14, line 9). However, claim 19 requires the portable terminal connected to the server through a wired or wireless network. *Stone* fails to disclose the element of a portable terminal as discussed above in the traversal of the rejection of claim 18. Accordingly, an analogous argument is hereby asserted in traversal of the alleged anticipation of claim 19 by *Stone* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) recited above. Therefore, at least for failing to disclose the element of a portable terminal connected to a wired or wireless network, the rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by *Stone* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 9 and 11 are rejected as being allegedly obvious over *Stone* in view of *Kay* (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,166) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 6 and 9 are cancelled, and the above rejection of said claims is moot.

Claim 4. The Examiner acknowledges that *Stone* fails to provide “transmitting the converted ticket related information to the portable terminal, wherein the ticket related information includes ticket unique identifier information...”, as required by claim 4. Therein, the Examiner relies on *Kay* to teach this element. *Kay* discloses a portable terminal for ticket verification/validation using unique signet and encryption methods (Fig. 1; abstract; col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 6 and lines 29-39; and col. 5, lines 30-34). The disclosure in *Kay* is limited to the verification/validation of printed tickets using a portable terminal.

In contrast, claim 4 requires, "...in transmitting converted ticket information to the portable terminal, the converted ticket related information includes message type information, ticket unique identifier information, encryption information for authentication, and ticket detail information, wherein the ticket is an electronic ticket."

A proper claim rejection on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) obviousness grounds must meet three criteria. First, there must be an explicit or implicit suggestion to combine the references; second, a reasonable expectation of success; and third, a suggestion or teaching of all claim limitations. Applicant discloses a paperless electronic ticket system where a portable terminal is used to request and purchase a ticket. The combination of *Stone* and *Kay* fail to provide a portable terminal for the request of tickets and for the verification of electronic tickets, and therefore the obviousness rejection of claim 4 over *Stone* in view of *Kay* under the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 contains subject matter analogous to that relied on above in the traversal of the rejection of claim 4. Accordingly, an analogous argument is hereby asserted in traversal of the rejection of claim 11. In turn, at least for failing to teach or suggest the element of storing ticket related information in the portable terminal..., wherein said ticket is an electronic ticket," the obviousness rejection of claim 11 over *Stone* in view of *Kay* under the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Stone* in view of *Lewis* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0105641) is rendered moot by the cancellation thereof.

Finally, claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Stone*.

Claims 21-24 are asserted as being in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependence upon an allowable claim.

In addition, claims 21-23 are asserted as being allowable on independent grounds. The Examiner acknowledges that the matter of claim 21, an SMS standard for use with a wide area network and an IrDA for use with a local area network, is not disclosed in *Stone*. However, the Examiner notes that such modes of communication are well known, and asserts that their implementation into a system such as that disclosed by *Stone* is obvious. A similar assertion of well known for Bluetooth (claim 22) and RF (claim 23) communication and their subsequent incorporation into *Stone* is made (OA page 11). *Stone* specifically cites dedicated data lines, public phone lines, and cellular communication, but fails to disclose the modes of communication cited in claims 21-23. Thus, *Stone* does not disclose the communication modes in claims 21-23, and the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), because the use of these modes of communication in a system of this type is not inherently obvious (MPEP §2143.01; *In re Mills*).

New independent claims 25 and 28 are believed to be allowable at least for the patentably distinguishable element of a portable terminal which sends ticket information from the portable terminal to an authentication processor.

New dependent claims 26 and 27 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable claim.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, she is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/808,030

ART UNIT 3629
Q62955

A Petition for Extension of Time with appropriate fee accompanies this document. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all additional required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any over-payments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.
Registration No. 52,049

Date: June 15, 2005



REQUEST C EARLY NOTIFICATION OF SERIAL NUMBER

Inventor(s): Chung-seob NA, You-hyun LEE, Seong-jin AHN

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PROVIDING AND USING
TICKET

Atty Doc. #: Q62955 Client: Y. P. LEE & ASSOCIATES

Filing Date: March 15, 2001 # Pgs. Spec/Abst: 20/1 #Claims: 24

Dwg. Sheets: 7 Decl NO Prelim Amdt NO

IDS/Prior Art: NO Pr Doc: YES(1) Asgmt: NO Fee: \$862.00

☐ Check Attached ☐ Charge to Deposit # 19-4880 Atty/Sec: DM/slb

SERIAL NO.:

CONF NO.:

